

New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

FRIDAY, JANUARY 12, 1917

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York. Office: 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone: 2000.

Subscription Rates: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York. Daily, 10 cents; Sunday, 5 cents. In Advance: 3 months, \$2.50; 6 months, \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00. Single Copies: 5 cents.

Foreign Rates: Daily, 15 cents; Sunday, 10 cents. In Advance: 3 months, \$7.50; 6 months, \$13.50; 1 year, \$24.00. Single Copies: 10 cents.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1917, under Post Office No. 154, New York, New York.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

The Fight on Mr. Daniels

Fifteen Senators, under the lead of Mr. Cummins, of Iowa, voted against confirming the nomination of Winthrop M. Daniels as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Mr. Daniels was named for a second term, and the fight against him was made squarely on his official record.

In our opinion he had clearly earned a re-nomination on that record. He has been one of the few members of the commission in recent years to take a broad, modern view of its functions. He has not subscribed to the theory, popular and no doubt excusable twenty years ago, that the commission's chief duty is to terrorize and discipline the owners and managers of railroads.

There was a time when rough and summary treatment was needed to reduce to good behavior railroad operators of a common type, inflated with a false sense of their power and using it to their own advantage and to the detriment not only of the public, but also of their own bondholders and stockholders. Government regulation was necessary in order to reach these misusers of trusts. It has reached most of them. It has thereby benefited the real owners of the railroads as much as it has benefited the payer of transportation charges. And no body of citizens in the country is to-day more unitedly in favor of stricter and complete regulation of railroad operations than the share owners and bondholders who have invested their money in railroad enterprises.

Mr. Daniels has always favored broad, intelligent, helpful regulation of the common carriers. The theory still prevailing in the commission—of punitive regulation and semi-starvation as a preventive of further misconduct—has not appealed to him. He has realized that in order to accomplish anything constructive the commission must turn away from the past and look to the future.

The transportation industry is one of our basic industries. If it suffers from artificial depression—the result of narrow-minded or vindictive regulation—many other industries must suffer. It is the greatest single instrument of nationalization in this country. It is the biggest centralizing force, pulling against the forces of separation, of the forty-eight systems of sovereignty in the forty-eight states. It is also one of the essential factors in national defense. No scheme of military preparedness would be worth much which was not based on the efficiency of our national transportation system and its availability for military uses.

So intelligent people everywhere are cutting loose from the prevailing theory of regulation—inherited from the period of granger state rebellion against the old-fashioned inequities of railroad operation. They see that a nationalized railroad system is one of the greatest factors in the economic and political progress of the United States. Anything that sustains, improves and extends such a system must benefit the whole country, and any policy which seeks to keep the railroads poor, weak, under-equipped and under-capitalized must react injuriously on the country in the not distant future.

Mr. Daniels has given his vote in the commission against the petty semi-starvation policy of the last ten or fifteen years. He has thereby incurred the enmity of those who still retain the old prejudices and see in every increase in railroad rates—however minute—a blow at the producers who have to use the railroads. Railroad rates are fixed by law. The prices of products shipped on the railroads have risen 20, 40, 100 per cent in the last two years. But there are still those who cry out in anguish against even a 5 per cent increase in freight rates as a crime against the shipper and the consumer.

The state railroad commissions in the Western States have taken the lead in recent years in the effort to prevent an extension of Federal regulation and to keep the existing form of regulation negative and punitive. They fear that their power will vanish if the regulation of the carriers becomes really nationalized, really constructive. So it will; and that would be one of the chief benefits of complete Federal regulation.

Their parochial spirit is manifest in the criticism made in the Senate on Mr. Daniels' nomination. Mr. Daniels, dissenting from the Interstate Commerce Commission's cheese-paring decision in the Western rate case, said very truly that "expected earnings constitute the bid which the carriers must make for new capital, for needed improvements, extensions, new rolling stock and similar purposes." Senator Cummins now denounces him for expressing such a view, on the ground that the railroads have not yet been punished sufficiently for past sins—sins which the carelessness of the state governments and the Federal government made possible.

Yet, except on the theory that the future good of the country must be sacri-

ficed for the sake of penalizing the present owners of the railroads for offences committed by unscrupulous operators years ago, what other policy is there to follow if the railroads are to do the work which the nation expects them to do? If Congress will not itself take over the railroads and make them an efficient and powerful agency of defence and economic progress, then the roads must have the opportunity to develop their facilities and strengthen their position through their ability to appeal to private capital. They constitute a national utility. It is absurd to deny them free growth and ample earning power under government regulation, since the benefits of that growth must in the end inure to the nation as well as to the stockholders.

More men like Mr. Daniels are needed on the Interstate Commerce Commission, not fewer. That commission should be enlarged and its powers should be greatly extended. But commissioners should also be found who will apply the powers of the commission to building up the railroads as a national agency of supreme importance, instead of hounding them and starving them into semi-bankruptcy and impotence.

Chicago's Police Scandal

We need not be too condescending toward our neighbors in Chicago over their police scandal. The temptations to graft in a great city are magnificent, and human nature is human nature. A fall from grace among subordinates is one of the fates which may overtake the best of departments. Besides, we are not so many years distant from an era when graft was the rule and a corrupt partnership with vice and crime the established system which every new Police Commissioner faced as a matter of course.

It is in a modest and thankful frame of mind that New Yorkers can contrast their present police administration with the corruption which is charged against Chicago's force, including its chief. Not a sensational overturning, but a slow moral regeneration, is the work which the citizens of our town have witnessed in the work of Mr. Woods. Man for man, there is no reason to set our force above the force of any other city. Human nature is much the same the country over. It is in appealing to the best side of his men, by applying scrupulous justice and encouraging bravery and fidelity, that our police head has accomplished the miracle that he has.

The task is a supremely difficult one from one aspect. It is simplicity itself from another. The mere order of Mayor Thompson of Chicago to his appointee that he "clean out immediately the corruption in all ranks of the department" is the least of the steps to be taken. The personality of the chief and the support given him are far more important. If Chicago can produce an Arthur Woods and give him free rein it will solve its police problem in one swift, simple manoeuvre.

To Curb the Mail Trucks

An issue of importance to this city—an issue which may become of much greater importance if Postmaster General Burleson has his way and curtails the mail tube service—is to be tried out by District Attorney Swann. He intends to ascertain whether the mail trucks actually are immune from local ordinances and state laws governing traffic. It seems that Mr. Swann himself on Wednesday night witnessed a collision between a mail truck and a limousine in Fifth Avenue. The mail truck, speeding west in Fortieth Street, did not slow down at the avenue, and as a result crashed into the limousine, bending its wheels and breaking its axle. Then, according to the District Attorney, the mail truck went on without a pause, but he ascertained its number.

This is a violation of the laws of the State of New York, which in an accident of that nature require the reporting of the case to the authorities. Since it came within the prosecutor's personal knowledge, it is probably as good an instance as any on which to build the test. The number of accidents due to the mail trucks has not been so great lately as it was a year or so ago, when there was scarcely a week without injury or death chargeable to them because the populace has learned, at its cost, to give these monsters the widest possible clearance, and the contractor company which uses them, warned by the manifestation of public indignation, urged its drivers to extra care about that time.

But a judicial decision whether these trucks have a right, as their drivers seem to think, to disregard all local regulation of traffic is none the less necessary. Some of the drivers are just as reckless as they ever were, and so long as the idea persists that they have any rights which an ordinary chauffeur has not the public will be in grave danger from them. It is to be hoped Mr. Swann will press this case and obtain a judicial ruling which will settle the matter once for all.

Untranslatable Phrases

It was obviously impossible to write about the late change of government in England without some reference to the celebrated motto of the late ministry, but to the correspondents of the French papers the phrase "Wait and see" presented so many difficulties that for the most part they were content to leave it untranslated. They perhaps did wisely, considering the bad shots some of them made at "Sinn Féin" some months ago. One explained that it meant literally "Penses à nous," recalling the German "Vergiss mein nicht" with "toute la sensibilité attendrissante et douceâtre de l'hyppocrisie boche." Another guessed boldly that Sinn was a fantastic form of the prefix syn- and Féin merely our old friend Fenian, the whole title implying that the rebels were associated with or belonged to the Fenian clan.

The difficulty in the case of "Wait and see" was not so great, however. It lay only in finding a properly terse French equivalent, yet but one correspondent, ac-

ording to "The Manchester Guardian's" London representative, even attempted a translation, and the result was not very happy: "Attendez, et vous verrez ce qui arrivera." This may possibly be the best that can be done, but it is manifestly lacking in concision. "Thirteen syllables against three!" says the English critic.

His comment recalls some of the late Herbert Spencer's objections to academies in his controversy with Matthew Arnold. Arnold was for the establishment of some English institution like the French Academy, but Spencer insisted that the academicians had done nothing at all to improve the French language. They still tolerated what he held to be the double negative, they still suffered such barbarisms as *Qu'est-ce que c'est que cela?*—six superfluous words, Spencer pointed out, counting *cela* as two. An analogous sentence in English is "What is that there here?" But such awkward construction "is held," says Spencer, "to imply entire absence of culture," and he discovers in the French phrase a want of that close adjustment of language and thought which even partially educated speakers of English have renounced.

But after all there are not scores of terse phrases in French that can only be expressed in a roundabout way in our language, if at all. It will not do to take one or two in English, and because they cannot be put as shortly in French to conclude that English is more concise. A stronger argument is offered by the Manchester critic. "At the beginning of the war," he says, "when all cables had to be in English or French, the Italian and Russian correspondents in London chose English, and found their cabling expenses much reduced." That, indeed, is a practical argument and much more to the point.

Authors Neither Heard Nor Seen

In the letter which Mr. Bernard Shaw wrote to his friends of the Drama League in defence of his liberties and declining to visit this land of the Mann act he remarked: "Authors, unlike good little children, should be heard, not seen." By "heard," he plainly meant "read"; for he was flatly refusing an invitation to lecture. An author's books were sufficient, seems to have been his point. To see or hear an author in the flesh is none of anybody's business.

Perhaps it is modesty that lies back of the modern dearth of lecturing writers. A few poets venture forth, Mr. Alfred Noyes, Mr. Wilfrid Gibson, and always our own Vachel Lindsay. They seem to find pleasure and profit in the spoken word. The tradition of their trade, from Homer down through Blondel, supports their practice. But what recent parallel is there for the famous visits of Thackeray and Dickens—or Matthew Arnold? Mr. Wells blows into America and writes up us. So does Mr. Bennett. The lecturing author is all but obsolete. And is it modesty that keeps them off stage, as Mr. Shaw implies?

The shifting of interest, of economic interest, of the cash, in short, seems the more likely explanation. The Chautauqua survives in lusty fashion in certain sections of America. But it is not the equivalent of the old Lyceum system. The spoken word, for better or worse, has yielded before the onrush of the printed word, drowned out in the rustle of one-cent newspapers and five and fifteen cent magazines. There the treasure is, the ten cents a word and upward; there the public is always waiting eagerly for more, and what author, however handsome or well spoken, can be expected to turn the stream uphill and insist upon speaking his pieces rather than writing them?

Take it simply as a question of influence, of human beings reached. There is no possible comparison between, let us say, Emerson lecturing and Mr. Bernard Shaw writing newspaper articles and plays. For hundreds that can attend a lecture tour there are millions to be reached through the front page of Sunday newspapers in a widely syndicated article. No; whether you are a preacher seeking souls to save or merely a thrifty manufacturer of popular trash, the answer is the same: Write, don't speak.

An Adventurous Mail Carrier

Earl L. Byers, nephew of H. W. Byers, Corporation Counsel for Des Moines, has one of the most unusual careers ever let by the United States government.

He has agreed to carry mail by airplane over a route in Alaska at a compensation of \$49,600 annually.

Byers will make two trips each week between Nome and a camp 381 miles inland. He will carry mail and passengers, and his service will bring the mining camp three weeks nearer the outside world.

The country over which he will fly is mountainous. There are no level tracts on which to make a landing in case his engine should stop. In winter the snowfall is between twenty-five and thirty feet deep. Even should Byers' airplane make a safe landing in the snow between terminals it would be impossible for the operator to get away again.

All of these possible troubles were considered by Byers before he took the contract. On a trial trip he carried four passengers, the weight being 1,000 pounds. He is using a Curtiss tractor, with various ideas in aerial navigation worked out by himself to meet conditions in Alaska.

Two Visitors to M. Cambon

Some months ago an old man called at the French Embassy and asked to see the ambassador. M. Cambon saw him, and the man produced a little square of old red silk. He explained that this was part of a tricolor flag captured at Waterloo by a party of soldiers which included his grandfather. They had cut up the flag, and this piece had been treasured in the family ever since. The old man felt that he could no longer keep it, and wished to hand it back to our friends, the French. Another visitor called carrying a heavy flat case. He opened it in the presence of the ambassador and showed a fine picture by Greuze, which he asked the ambassador to receive as a gift to France. The donor said that it had been in his family for some time, and he wanted now to present it to France for a French museum, or to be sold for the French hospital funds, or anything which wished. He refused to give his name, and left he knew to his identity but the picture. Both of these donors mentioned Verdun as deciding them to give back these things to France.

WHY GUARDSMEN DON'T RE-ENLIST

Conditions and Spirit Declared To Be Wrong in Militia

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: It is with a feeling of anger, I believe, that the average American will read in his morning paper that five men in the 2d Field Artillery were "spread-eagled."

It has long been known to most men that in conditions are not what they should be in the Guard, and that the average American man of spirit and respect for himself will not enlist. What the Guardsmen have gone through who have just come back from the border will be the cause of the failure of the National Guard as a means of national defence. It is the fault of no one but the government, in that it allows conditions to exist in army circles which cause the outsider (the plain American citizen) who is now and has at all times been a good, conscientious and patriotic citizen, to refuse to serve his government.

These men who join the Guard give their time, train themselves to be soldiers, hold themselves liable for service at all times, and some even pay to be admitted to the Guard, and when called out lose their civil rights and come under army regulations for what? When called out, as in the recent Mexican crisis, they left their homes and families, gave up their business, and they get no return at all from the government commensurate with what they give? In a good many cases these Guardsmen came back with little money, with no positions (having lost them when sent to the border) and with immediate calls for money with which to meet expenses.

Besides all that, they are treated as if they have an officer who does not respect their rights. Also, if an officer has a grudge against a man under him, there are more ways than one in which he can make life unbearable for him. Your paper prints to-day that 84 per cent of the Guard will not re-enlist, and why? Surely in a matter as vital as this there should be an investigation that is an investigation to determine why they will not re-enlist and why these five men revolted against their officer.

The average American is a proud man, with spirit, character and respect for himself and others, with broad thoughts and ideals as regards the institutions and freedom of the American people. When by mischance he joins the Guard and finds conditions opposite to what he expected, that he is not treated with the man-to-man respect (he having given the obedience due to those in command) which should be the right of every citizen who serves his country with no return, he naturally has the right to feel disgusted.

If we return to the principle we had in the Revolutionary War, when our Minute Men held themselves ready at all times to serve their country, to give their lives and their property with no return, but who insisted that they be treated as men, with respect for them as such, and if you took the millions in this country, who, I am sure, feel much the same—if you would give them an opportunity to train under conditions where there would be no chance for them to ever lose their self-respect, then this country would never have to fear about protecting itself.

W. L. W.

New York, Jan. 10, 1917.

Universal Service to Break Caste

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: As a citizen and an ex-soldier, I want to enter my protest against the humiliating spectacle of a man in uniform exposed to public degradation as Private Max Kellerman, of Battery E, of the 2d Field Artillery, has been exposed by Lieutenant Spencer. It is just such actions as these that deprive the average man of any respect toward the uniform of a soldier. The system of the militia is wrong to the core, as it does not provide for military efficiency nor democracy of management. But the idea of an officer punishing a man for an offence in a spirit totally different from the United States Army regulations and usages is more than degrading; it is idiotic. It is an overstepping of all rights of an officer and instils the spirit of mutiny and rebellion against injustice.

In the militia as it is organized to-day there cannot be efficiency because the proper methods do not prevail. I am given to understand by men in the ranks that the usual election of officers is brought about either through the use of money or social pull. I thoroughly believe in universal training in order to achieve a standing army efficient. If a man wishes to enjoy the privileges of the country, he should be man enough to serve the country in return for the benefits he receives. Only in universal service will the public realize the true value of military training and the management of the army will become truly efficient, and we will avoid the military caste spirit which prevails so strongly now in the regular army and militia.

JOHN W. ROBERTS.

New York, Jan. 10, 1917.

An Argument Against Universal Service

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: It is to be hoped that The Tribune will do more than report the "spread-eagling" of the New York Guardsmen. At the present time the American public is very much interested in the conduct of army officers. Thoughtful men and women are beginning to appreciate the necessity of universal military service. But if the commanding and other officers are going to lord it over the men, the citizenry of the country will prove very reluctant to give any more power to present tyrants.

Discipline we must have, but the man in the ranks is not a slave. An officer who lacks self-control is the strongest argument against universal service. Military tyranny will always be abhorred to the American people. If the "lords of a day" do these things right here in New York City, what must have been done on the border? Perhaps there is truth in the rumor that a New York militia officer had a hardwood floor in his tent and had two officers catering to his delicate palate, while the men in the ranks wallowed in mud and were often hungry.

JAMES S. REILLY.

Brooklyn, Jan. 10, 1917.

"The Unmanly West"

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Under the caption "The Unmanly West" a person signing himself "An American by Adoption" and calling himself an Anglo-Swiss by ancestry makes a cowardly blanket attack upon the men of the West. The Tribune issue of January 8. It is a wild, uncontrolled, fire-eating type of attack, and it is easy to discern the lawless, unthinking spirit behind it.

The gentleman who dares not sign his name gives every indication of being a cave man pure and simple, and as such his contemptible attack on the courage of the men of the West may be easily dismissed. One might read between the lines of his article a bitter, unadmitted resentment at the defeat of his Presidential candidate by the West, and a spilling over of spite, venom and gall because the country chooses to weigh thoughtfully the pros and cons of universal military training. I fear the gentleman is not living up to the "Anglo" part of his ancestry, which tradition credits with knowing how to take defeat in a sportsmanlike manner in a fair game.

CLARA M. SCHLINGENDEYER.

A Western woman.

New York, Jan. 9, 1917.

PREPAREDNESS TO PREVENT WAR

Let the Government Plan to Take Over All Property and Labor at the Outbreak of Hostilities—Nationalization Would Render Universal Training Acceptable to All, and Making War Unprofitable, Would Remove Its Cause

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The term "preparedness" seems to be quite as general and indefinite as when it was first hurled at us as a political slogan.

Through a political campaign, the daily press and the magazines have been treated to oratory and literature of all grades, from the quiet facts set forth by army and navy experts up to the hysterical shrieces of the ultra timid, but as yet there seems to be no definite programme in sight.

War is a dreaded disease which all desire to avoid, and like other diseases, it is most feared when it is raging. The prospect of peace in Europe, and the glaring failure of our present military system so completely demonstrated on the Mexican border, brings to us a new interest in this question at this time.

War is a disease which afflicted the human race since the beginning of time. History is a record of wars, so we have abundant data on which to base our study, and we will find the cause of all the wars of the world, throughout all time, has been practically the same. It can be stated as follows:

A man, or group of men, dominating or ruling a body of men, a tribe or a nation, have, by force, enticement or misdirection, caused an attack on other groups, tribes or nations of men for the purpose of increasing the wealth, power or glory of the aggressor man or group.

In other words, somebody desired something which he could gain by war, and in order to gain that something, he or they, being in a position of command, brought about the war for selfish ends.

An analysis of all wars, since the beginning of the world, will not only prove the correctness of the above statement, but will also show that whatever wealth, power or glory was won went to the ruling few, while the reward of the masses was death, poverty and suffering.

In discussing the present war reference is constantly made to Germany, as though this war were one for which the German people are responsible, and indirectly that is true, because the German people have tolerated and even believe in their present form of government, but directly the responsibility of this war rests, not on the German people, but on Germany's rulers and military caste.

For years the rulers of Germany have educated the people to believe in their rulers, and in wars, so that when the time was ripe they could be used to bring other people under their sway and thus add to their power and wealth. The Kaiser puts it that Germany is fighting for her place in the sun, and the tragedy of it is that the unthinking masses believe him because they have been educated that way.

Does any one imagine that, had the German military machine overrun all Europe, the people of Germany would have gained a greater place in the sun, or a larger piece of earth, or a better living condition individually than they had before the war started?

What possible advantage could have come to the people of Germany, as individuals, even to the people of Germany, as a whole, from a sweeping victory? A few generals would have been honored and rewarded by gifts, for which the people would pay. A number of statues and triumphal arches would have been erected to perpetuate the memory of the most successful commanders, for which the people would pay. The army would be increased in order to hold in subjugation the conquered peoples, for which the people would pay. And, all in all, the Kaiser and his military aristocracy would strut a little more, be a little more arrogant and domineering, the people would pay the expenses and would still be "verboten."

It is the old story of thirst for power and self-glorification demonstrated by kings and potentates from the beginning of history.

Removing Its Cause
If laws can be devised which will make the gratification of such desires through war impossible, the cause of aggressive or offensive war will be removed so we can prepare for defensive war without the risk of causing war. The strongest argument of the pacifist—that preparedness for war will cause war—will be answered, and the greatest objection to universal military training and a strong navy will be removed. In order to accomplish this, laws must be enacted which will make the burden of war rest equally on all, and will make personal gain by war impossible.

As a means to this end, it is suggested that the following be enacted into law:
Immediately on the declaration of war by the President and Congress of the United States every citizen shall be by such declaration automatically drafted into the service of the United States, and all property shall be come by such declaration automatically the property of the United States during the continuance of a state of war.

On the declaration of war, and at all times during the continuance thereof, each citizen shall perform his accustomed vocation or pursuit, and no citizen shall make a change of residence or employment without the consent of the government authority in charge of the district in which he or she resides at the time of such declaration.

All persons within the United States, whether citizen or alien, will be deemed to be at the disposal of the United States government for either civil or military duty, and all property of every kind and description, regardless of ownership, becomes the property of the United States government, and the right of the United States, provided only that all property shall be returned to its proper ownership at the conclusion of the war in as good condition as the hazards of war and the exigencies of the situation will permit, but all profits of every kind and description from the operation of all property and the conduct of all business during the continuance of a state of war shall be and becomes the property of the United States government.

Fixed Wages for All
Every citizen and every alien who continues in the service of the United States during the continuance of a state of war shall receive the emoluments fixed by government authority. Emoluments shall be the same, regardless of sex or employment.

Persons who before the declaration of war were not profitably employed, and who are not called upon for service, shall be cared for at the discretion of the proper government authorities of the district in which he or she resides, but no emolument other than necessary living expenses shall be allowed to any person not employed.

No military or other title of honor or distinction shall be applied by any person to himself nor to another person, except under special laws and regulations governing special service, and all such titles shall be discontinued when such special service shall end.

No attempt is made to propose these laws in detail, nor in legal language. A rough form only is here suggested, which our legislators may fashion into the finished instrument with which to remove the causes of war from our civilization and thus prevent war.

The effect desired to be obtained by the enactment of the above laws is that during a state of war no person shall profit by that war; all business will go on just as usual, but the government will take all the profits, and no person shall gain a military title, but shall remain in honor or distinguish him after the war has closed.

What we remove from war all chance of personal profit and personal distinction. It also means that every person employed either in military or civil service shall receive the same compensation as the private soldier.

"Every person" means from the President of the United States down. It is hard to imagine President Wilson, Charles M. Schwab, Frank A. Vanderlip, president of the National City Bank, Mr. Brisbane, head of the Hearst papers; Judge Gary, chairman of the Steel Trust, and other such high salaried men working for \$15 a month and found, but since we would all be coming to the same compensation, their wealth and their big salaries, why should they not contribute their energies to that cause for the same compensation as the laboring man whose reward for fighting will be the right to keep on laboring?

Whatever may be said as to the preparedness doctrine suggested here, we submit that the justice of it must be recognized.

Fighting by Experts
War has ceased to be a military science. The winning of a war depends more upon the proper use of the mechanical than upon any military strategy. This being the case, the best men to handle the situation would be men who have had experience in the handling of large bodies of men in commercial and manufacturing enterprises and in directing the policy of large corporations.

Our specialists in military tactics, who are educated at Annapolis and West Point, are indispensable and valuable assets, but the winning of a war depends upon the coordination of other elements in which these men have had no experience.

Which we show presently by the position in which we stand to-day. She is top-heavy in man power, but so deficient in commercial development that she cannot use her men to advantage because she is unable to equip them and get them to the point where they can be effectively used at the proper time. A perfectly trained military force is worthless without a perfectly coordinated

PREPAREDNESS TO PREVENT WAR

Let the Government Plan to Take Over All Property and Labor at the Outbreak of Hostilities—Nationalization Would Render Universal Training Acceptable to All, and Making War Unprofitable, Would Remove Its Cause

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: The term "preparedness" seems to be quite as general and indefinite as when it was first hurled at us as a political slogan.

Through a political campaign, the daily press and the magazines have been treated to oratory and literature of all grades, from the quiet facts set forth by army and navy experts up to the hysterical shrieces of the ultra timid, but as yet there seems to be no definite programme in sight.

War is a dreaded disease which all desire to avoid, and like other diseases, it is most feared when it is raging. The prospect of peace in Europe, and the glaring failure of our present military system so completely demonstrated on the Mexican border, brings to us a new interest in this question at this time.

War is a disease which afflicted the human race since the beginning of time. History is a record of wars, so we have abundant data on which to base our study, and we will find the cause of all the wars of the world, throughout all time, has been practically the same. It can be stated as follows:

A man, or group of men, dominating or ruling a body of men, a tribe or a nation, have, by force, enticement or misdirection, caused an attack on other groups, tribes or nations of men for the purpose of increasing the wealth, power or glory of the aggressor man or group.

In other words, somebody desired something which he could gain by war, and in order to gain that something, he or they, being in a position of command, brought about the war for selfish ends.

An analysis of all wars, since the beginning of the world, will not only prove the correctness of the above statement, but will also show that whatever wealth, power or glory was won went to the ruling few, while the reward of the masses was death, poverty and suffering.

In discussing the present war reference is constantly made to Germany, as though this war were one for which the German people are responsible, and indirectly that is true, because the German people have tolerated and even believe in their present form of government, but directly the responsibility of this war rests, not on the German people, but on Germany's rulers and military caste.

For years the rulers of Germany have educated the people to believe in their rulers, and in wars, so that when the time was ripe they could be used to bring other people under their sway and thus add to their power and wealth. The Kaiser puts it that Germany is fighting for her place in the sun, and the tragedy of it is that the unthinking masses believe him because they have been educated that way.

Does any one imagine that, had the German military machine overrun all Europe, the people of Germany would have gained a greater place in the sun, or a larger piece of earth, or a better living condition individually than they had before the war started?

What possible advantage could have come to the people of Germany, as individuals, even to the people of Germany, as a whole, from a sweeping victory? A few generals would have been honored and rewarded by gifts, for which the people would pay. A number of statues and triumphal arches would have been erected to perpetuate the memory of the most successful commanders, for which the people would pay. The army would be increased in order to hold in subjugation the conquered peoples, for which the people would pay. And, all in all, the Kaiser and his military aristocracy would strut a little more, be a little more arrogant and domineering, the people would pay the expenses and would still be "verboten."

It is the old story of thirst for power and self-glorification demonstrated by kings and potentates from the beginning of history.

Removing Its Cause
If laws can be devised which will make the gratification of such desires through war impossible, the cause of aggressive or offensive war will be removed so we can prepare for defensive war without the risk of causing war. The strongest argument of the pacifist—that preparedness for war will cause war—will be answered, and the greatest objection to universal military training and a strong navy will be removed. In order to accomplish this